

Exhibit 6E

Emails (K001265-1266; 1272-1273)

Sharon Zimmerman

From: Rip Rapson
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2014 6:36 PM
To: daniel.howes@detroitnews.com
Subject: FW: DIA governance

From: Rip Rapson
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2014 8:23 PM
To: Darren Walker
Subject: FW: DIA governance

Greetings Darren:

Thank you for your thoughtful response. As Laura, Rob, Steve Hamp, and I have tossed this around, it strikes us that a more active, facilitative approach - rather than a harder stance - seems appropriate and might serve to help unify the philanthropic community. Our thought is that we might engage more actively with the DIA's leadership to help surface ideas that ensure the best possible future governance of the institution.

With apologies, let me try out on you how I think we might position this.

A Frame

We start from the proposition that the DIA's leadership is - understandably and rigidly - in a defensive crouch. The DIA has been in survival mode for many years, warding off first the challenges of fiscal instability and then the serious threat of art sales (or worse) from the bankruptcy. This has been compounded by being located in a declining city and depressed economic environment.

If the ArtTrust effort is successful, all of these factors will change, opening up the opportunity for the DIA to enter an entirely new chapter of its future. It will be freed from dire, constant funding challenges and from the doomsday threat of city bankruptcy for the city. It would be liberated to appreciate the new reality that its location in Detroit can be a positive factor in its future success. Just as the City is hitting the re-set button, so too would the DIA.

I think it will be important to convey to the DIA's leadership our belief that the DIA has the opportunity to re-imagine what it wants to become next. A stronger driver of efforts to restore the City to greatness. A more engaged partner in community redevelopment efforts. An emblematic institution for museums across the country who now view the DIA as perilously close to collapse.

But that re-imagination requires a reconceptualization of the governance model. A revitalized, renewed, and re-positioned DIA won't emerge automatically, but instead through a carefully crafted redefinition of mission and direction. Changes in governance will be essential to that task.

It's not the foundations' remit to define for the DIA how all of this plays out - or even exactly what elements it has to buy lock, stock, and barrel. But we do have a stake - one far more substantial than I think Gene and his colleagues have contemplated. I would accordingly propose that we open the conversation with them as a way of helping them stand outside of their received perspective and take in input they are unaccustomed to hearing. My hope is that this could be done in a way that is neither directive nor presumptuous, but is instead suggestive and supportive. And it would, I believe, lead naturally to the questions of how to build the kind of board, structures, and team the DIA will need to move forward most fruitfully.

Kresge's Conversations with the DIA

As I mentioned in my earlier note, Laura and Rob (who sits on the DIA's Investment Committee) have had a number of conversations with the DIA's leadership over the last weeks. Laura spoke with Gene Gargaro this afternoon. She reminded Gene that our Legal Committee had begun its work by analyzing Judge Rosen's proposal to form a entirely new entity to receive the DIA's assets. The Committee chose not to go that route, advocating instead with the Judge to keep the DIA in the ownership role. Laura assured Gene that the foundations don't want to dictate a structure, but rather to ensure a form of future governance is fully able to encompass future realities. Gene agreed with this wholeheartedly and assured her the DIA will welcome this kind of dialogue.

Laura and Gene agreed that the foundations and DIA have to move forward in full partnership on all fronts -- mutually committed to providing support for the city in its time of crisis and helping the pensioners who could lose much of their livelihood. We might start by establishing, much as we did with the Legal Committee, some first principles on which both sides could agree. We could then actively raise and assess options. But at some point, the process will need to be handed off to the DIA for them to design a governance structure that ultimately serves their needs.

Because that couldn't be ironed out before tomorrow's release to the creditors of the Plan of Adjustment, Laura and Gene agree to meet later this week and think through what this kind of process might look like and how best to move it forward.

I'd suggest that Laura carry into that meeting a suggestion that the process include several foundation partners (perhaps the members of Judge Rosen's steering committee?), as well as a couple of other entities that have a stake in the outcome, particularly the City of Detroit and State of Michigan. In the meantime, we might ask for a seat or two on the DIA Board until this process has been completed.

I have no sense of whether this approach would be well-received by our other funder colleagues. But I think we might propose it to them and see if there are others who see this as beneficial or have other suggestions for how we might proceed.

Again, sorry for the length. But thanks for listening.

Very best,

Rip

Sharon Zimmerman

From: Howes, Daniel <Daniel.Howes@detroitnews.com>
Sent: Monday, May 12, 2014 10:50 AM
To: Rip Rapson
Subject: RE: Your column

Rip:

Let's discuss. Have a few thoughts. Can we chat today? Think I see fodder for another column in this issue.

-- DCH

Daniel Howes
Business Columnist & Associate Business Editor
The Detroit News
615 W. Lafayette Blvd.
Detroit, MI. 48124

W: +1.313.222.2106
Mobile: +1.313.632.1945
E-mail: daniel.howes@detroitnews.com
My webpage: <http://detroitnews.com/howes>

From: Rip Rapson <RRapson@kresge.org>
Sent: Friday, May 9, 2014 8:08 PM
To: Howes, Daniel
Subject: Your column

What a masterful column Daniel. Congratulations - the clearest statement we've had on the true implications of what we've navigated and on the potential for where we might land.

I've been in quite a tizzy, together with a great number of others, by the news today that Bolger is, in fact, not willing to compromise on his demand for a union contribution to the bargain. When I last heard this discussed among people in a position to know - Wednesday night - it seemed as if some options were being generated to permit Bolger to save face and move the package forward. But the Governor and Judge Rosen are of the view - as of today - that the bills will not be permitted to the floor without a union contribution. Evidently, the amount can be relatively *de minimus* to satisfy Bolger and his caucus. But it's very hard for me to see how even a \$5 million contribution comes together - what the source would be, how the unions would stomach it, and on and on.

Darren Walker and I have had conversations all around the horn, and creativity seems to be in remarkably short supply. I do have some confidence that Mayor Duggan may have an angle in on this - earlier this week, he suggested that something was in the works. But it struck me reading your piece that I would be crazy not to ask your advice - less as a journalist than as someone who knows all the players, has deep insight about the motivations driving each of the parties, and might see a path out of this that the rest of us haven't thought about. Any thoughts?

Thanks,

Rip